

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action.

The Office action indicated a possibility of allowability, albeit equivocally, as to claims 8-10 if they were rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended to overcome the rejection based on indefiniteness.

However, in regard to the limitations of claim 8, now incorporated into independent claim 1, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The Office action suggested using language such as an "elongated convex" or "concave" portion of the face member instead of "a recessed portion" or "a projected portion". Such language is substantially narrower in scope than the present form. The current language is meant to include other embodiments of the recessed or projected portion in addition to embodiments of the face member with an elongate convex or concave portion. Therefore, the limitation, as previously worded in claim 8, has not been amended. Moreover, the prior art does not disclose a face member with a recessed portion or a projected portion.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 7 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,761,529 to Tsisios (hereinafter “Tsisios”).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 8 and, therefore, the Examiner’s rejection is rendered moot.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tsisios in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,471,914 to Krasznai et al. (hereinafter “Krasznai”).

In regard to claim 3, a heat shielding member with “a V-shaped section projecting to the rod-like heater” is not disclosed in Krasznai or any other reference in the prior art. It is further to be noted that the limitation requires a heat shielding member and that the heat shielding member be provided between the rod-like heater and the face member. Therefore, the Examiner’s rejection is rendered moot as to the limitation in claim 3. New claims 11-18 have been added focusing on this limitation.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 38341.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 18, 2007